



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/556,558	11/14/2005	Gianni Perdomi	MI 6109 (US)	8649
34872	7590	03/25/2009		
Basell USA Inc. Delaware Corporate Center II 2 Righter Parkway, Suite #300 Wilmington, DE 19803			EXAMINER KRYLOVA, IRINA	
			ART UNIT 1796	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/25/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/556,558	Applicant(s) PERDOMI, GIANNI	
	Examiner Irina Krylova	Art Unit 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/14/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 7-11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 7 of copending Application No.10/557,297. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following reasons.

2. The copending application 10/557,297 ('297) claims a stretchable film comprising a polymer blend comprising:

Art Unit: 1796

1) 50-90%wt of ethylene polymer composition having a density of 0.92-0.94 g/ml, the ethylene polymer comprising an interpolymer of ethylene with at least one comonomer comprising ethylenically unsaturated organic monomer of esters of unsaturated C3-C20 monocarboxylic acids and C1-C24 monovalent aliphatic or alicyclic alcohols, wherein the ester content ranges from 2.5-8wt%; and

2) 10-50% of an ethylene-based polymer component having a density ranging from 0.90-0.93 g/ml and a MFR up to 4 g/10 min; the ethylene-based polymer component being selected from the group consisting of:

(i) a linear polyethylene consisting of ethylene and 0.5-20% by mole of a $\text{CH}_2=\text{CHR}$ alpha-olefin; wherein R is a hydrocarbon having 2-8 carbon atoms; and

ii) a polymer blend comprising (a) 80-100 parts by weight of a random polymer of ethylene with $\text{CH}_2=\text{CHR}$ alpha-olefin, the random polymer (a) containing up to 20%mol of an alpha-olefin having a density between 0.88-0.945 g/ml; and (b) from 5-30 parts by weight of a random interpolymer of propylene with an alpha-olefin; wherein the interpolymer (b) contains 60-98%wt of propylene units; 2-40%wt of an alpha-olefin units; and 0-10%wt of ethylene units.

3. Therefore, the film comprising the polymer composition claimed in the instant invention is the same as the polymer composition used for making films in the copending application '297. Though the instant application does not claim specific properties, such as a value of MD tensile strength at 30% ranging between 6.5 to 15 N, nevertheless, since the composition claimed in the instant invention is the same as

Art Unit: 1796

claimed in the copending application '297, this property is considered to be inherent.

“Products of identical chemical composition can not have mutually exclusive properties”

(See MPEP 2112.01).

4. Though the instant application claims the ratio between MD tear resistance and the TD tear resistance being 0.3 or less, whereas the copending application'297 claims this ratio being over 0.3, nevertheless, it is the examiner's position that the values are close enough that one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected the same properties.

Case law holds that a prima facie case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties. *Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1796

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1) Claim 7 recites limitation “polymer blend” several times in relation to “up to 20 mol% of an alpha-olefin” in line 19; “having density between...” in line 20; and “having a xylene-soluble fraction...” in line 28. However, it is not clear if the cited limitations are related to each of the polymer in the blend individually, or to the final blend. In addition, instant specification on page 2 specifies these limitations as related to each of the polymers in the blend.

2) Claim 7 on page 2, line 1 recites the limitation “xylene-insoluble fraction at room temperature is greater than 70%”. This limitation has insufficient antecedent basis since the instant specification on page 5 recites “greater than 75%, preferably greater than 85%”.

3) Claim 7 in (ii) provides limitations for a “polymer blend comprising a) 80-100 pbw of random interpolymer of ethylene... and b) 5-30 pbw of a random interpolymer of propylene ...”. The ratios between the components a) and b) do not make sense since 30 pbw of component b) will not allow to take 80-100 pbw of the component a). In addition, it is not clear relatively to which component “parts by weight” ratios are taken;

4) Claim 7 in line 28, page 1 of claims, and lines 1-3 on page 2 of claims, recites “a polymer blend having a xylene-soluble fraction at room temperature greater than 70%”. It is not clear if the term “polymer blend” belongs to the polymer blend (A) or (ii).

Art Unit: 1796

5) Claim 9 recites the limitation "ethylene polymer composition comprising a comonomer selected from butene-1, hexene-1...". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The disclosure does not provide any description of the use of these monomers in the copolymer of ethylene with ester-containing monomers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over **Cooper** (US 4,504,434).

7. **Cooper** discloses a stretch film comprising (as to instant claim 7, 8):

1) 40-90%wt of an ethylene-vinyl acetate copolymer containing 4-25%wt of vinyl acetate units;

2) 8-55%wt of a linear ethylene-higher olefin copolymer having a specific gravity of 0.917-0.926 (col. 5, lines 67-68) and melt index 0.5-3.0 (Abstract, col. 5, lines 59-62).

The higher olefin comprises butene , hexene or octene (col. 5, lines 61-63).

Art Unit: 1796

8. The preferred ethylene-vinyl acetate copolymer is a commercially available “Ultrathene 657” which comprises a density of 0.932 g/cc (see page 14 in EVA-data sheet).

9. Though **Cooper** does not specify the content of alpha-olefin units in the ethylene-higher olefin copolymer, however, since the final copolymer comprises the same density and the same melt index as the copolymer claimed in the instant invention, therefore, it would have been obvious to a one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made that the content of the olefin comonomer in the ethylene-olefin copolymer would fall within the same ranges claimed in the instant invention.

10. Though **Cooper** does not specify the ratio between MD Elmendorf tear resistance and a TD Elmendorf tear resistance, however, since the composition of Cooper is identical to the composition claimed in the instant invention, therefore, it would have been obvious to a one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made that that this ratio between MD and TD tear resistance would fall within the same ranges claimed in the instant invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1796

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over **Glick et al** (US 2003/0044551).

12. **Glick et al** discloses a film structure comprising an ethylene-vinyl acetate outer layers and an inner layer comprising a blend (as to instant claim 7, cited in Abstract):

1) 40-95%wt of a copolymer of an ethylene with up to 40%wt of an alkyl acrylate, particularly butyl acrylate (as to instant claim 8, cited in [0030]);

2) 5-60%wt of a linear low density metallocene polyethylene having a density 0.917 g/cc (see [0034]-[0035]).

As to instant claim 12, the film may be used packaging ([0039]).

13. With regard to other properties claimed by Applicant, such as density of the ethylene-alkyl acrylate copolymer, a MFR of the linear polyethylene, and a ratio between MD tear resistance and TD tear resistance for the inner layer film comprising

Art Unit: 1796

the blend of the ethylene-alkyl acrylate copolymer and the LLDPE, it is noted here that the present rejection with regard to these properties is made in the sense of **In re Fitzgerald**, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980), which states that when the structure or composition recited in the reference is substantially identical to that of the claims of the instant invention, claimed properties or functions presumed to be inherent (MPEP 2112-2112.01). A prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established when the reference discloses all the limitations of a claim (in this case, the identical polymeric films) except for a property or function (in the present case, density of the ethylene-alkyl acrylate copolymer, a MFR of the linear polyethylene, and a ratio between MD tear resistance and TD tear resistance for the inner layer film comprising the blend of the ethylene-alkyl acrylate copolymer and the LLDPE,) and the examiner can not determine whether or not the reference inherently possesses properties that anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention but has a basis for shifting the burden of proof to applicant. See also **In re Spada**, 911 F 2d 705, 709 15 USPQ 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990), which settles that **when** the claimed compositions **are not novel**, they are not rendered patentable by recitation of properties, whether or **not** these properties are shown or suggested in prior art.

14. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. **102(e)** as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over **Glick et al** (US 2003/0044551).

Art Unit: 1796

15. Glick et al discloses a film structure comprising an ethylene-vinyl acetate outer layers and an inner layer comprising a blend (as to instant claim 7, cited in Abstract):

- 1) 40-95%wt of a copolymer of an ethylene with up to 40%wt of an alkyl acrylate, particularly butyl acrylate (as to instant claim 8, cited in [0030]);
- 2) 5-60%wt of a linear low density metallocene polyethylene having a density 0.917 g/cc (see [0034]-[0035]).

As to instant claim 12, the film may be used packaging ([0039]).

16. With regard to other properties claimed by Applicant, such as density of the ethylene-alkyl acrylate copolymer, a MFR of the linear polyethylene, and a ratio between MD tear resistance and TD tear resistance for the inner layer film comprising the blend of the ethylene-alkyl acrylate copolymer and the LLDPE, it is noted here that the present rejection with regard to these properties is made in the sense of **In re Fitzgerald**, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980), which states that when the structure or composition recited in the reference is substantially identical to that of the claims of the instant invention, claimed properties or functions presumed to be inherent (MPEP 2112-2112.01). A prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established when the reference discloses all the limitations of a claim (in this case, the identical polymeric films) except for a property or function (in the present case, density of the ethylene-alkyl acrylate copolymer, a MFR of the linear polyethylene, and a ratio between MD tear resistance and TD tear resistance for the inner layer film comprising the blend of the ethylene-alkyl acrylate copolymer and the LLDPE,) and the

Art Unit: 1796

examiner can not determine whether or not the reference inherently possesses properties that anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention but has a basis for shifting the burden of proof to applicant. See also ***In re Spada***, 911 F 2d 705, 709 15 USPQ 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990), which settles that **when** the claimed compositions **are not novel**, they are not rendered patentable by recitation of properties, whether or **not** these properties are shown or suggested in prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Cooper** (US 4,504,434) as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of **Govoni et al** (WO 95/20009).

The discussion with respect to **Cooper** (US 4,504,434) as set forth in paragraph above is incorporated here by reference.

18. Cooper fails to teach the use of a polymer blend comprising:

Art Unit: 1796

a) 80-100 pbw of a random interpolpolymer of ethylene with up to 20%mol of at least one $\text{CH}_2=\text{CHR}$ alpha-olefin, where R is a hydrocarbon having 1-10 carbon atoms, having a density of 0.88-0.945 g/ml;

b) 5-30 pbw of a random interpolpolymer of propylene with at least one $\text{CH}_2=\text{CHR}$ alpha-olefin, wherein R is a hydrocarbon having 2-10 carbon atoms; the interpolpolymer comprising 60-98%wr of propylene; 2-40%wt of alpha-olefin; 0-10%wt ethylene units; wherein the xylene-insoluble fraction at room temperature greater than 70%.

19. Govoni et al discloses a polymeric composition for making films comprising :

1) 75-95%wt of a copolymer of ethylene with up to 20% mole an alpha-olefin $\text{CH}_2=\text{CHR}$, where R comprises an alkyl radical having 1-10 carbon atoms, having a density 0.88-0.945 g/cc (as to instant claim 10, cited on page 6, lines 3-6);

2) 5-25%wt of a copolymer of propylene with ethylene and at least one alpha-olefin $\text{CH}_2=\text{CHR}'$, wherein R' is an alkyl radical having 2-10 carbon atoms, wherein the copolymer comprises:

-- 80-98%wt propylene;

-- 1-10%wt ethylene;

-- 1-10%wt alpha-olefin, particularly butene (as to instant claim 11, cited on page 5, lines 13-15; page 7, lines 12-15); and the copolymer is characterized by an insolubility in xylene of higher than 70% (page 4, lines 12-22).

Art Unit: 1796

20. Since **Govoni et al** discloses a similar ethylene-based copolymer blend including similar densities as the ethylene-alpha-olefin copolymer of **Cooper**, but having improved processability and improved mechanical properties (see page 1, lines 4-7 in **Govoni et al**), therefore, it would have been obvious to a one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the ethylene-based copolymer blend of **Govoni et al** in the composition of **Cooper** to produce films having improved processability and improved mechanical properties (see page 1, lines 4-7 in **Govoni et al**).

21. Since the composition of **Cooper** in view of **Govoni et al** is essentially the same as claimed in the instant invention, therefore, the ratio between MD tear resistance and TD tear resistance will obviously fall within the same ranges as claimed in the instant invention.

22. As to instant claim 12, though the use of the composition for making the elastic tapes is not specifically recited, since the composition of **Cooper** in view of **Govoni et al** comprises improved physical properties, including improved tear resistance (see page 9 in **Govoni et al**), and both compositions of **Cooper** and **Govoni et al** are used for making films, therefore, it would have been obvious to a one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made, to produce multilayered extruded films to be used as tapes.

23. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Glick et al** (US 2003/0044551), as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of **Govoni et al** (WO 95/20009).

24. The discussion with respect to **Glick et al** (US 2003/0044551) as set forth in paragraph above is incorporated here by reference.

25. **Glick et al** fails to teach the use of a polymer blend comprising:

- a) 80-100 pbw of a random interpolpolymer of ethylene with up to 20%mol of at least one CH₂=CHR alpha-olefin, where R is a hydrocarbon having 1-10 carbon atoms, having a density of 0.88-0.945 g/ml;
- b) 5-30 pbw of a random interpolpolymer of propylene with at least one CH₂=CHR alpha-olefin, wherein R is a hydrocarbon having 2-10 carbon atoms; the interpolpolymer comprising 60-98%wr of propylene; 2-40%wt of alpha-olefin; 0-10%wt ethylene units; wherein the xylene-insoluble fraction at room temperature greater than 70%.

26. **Govoni et al** discloses a polymeric composition for making films comprising :

- 1) 75-95%wt of a copolymer of ethylene with up to 20% mole an alpha-olefin CH₂=CHR, where R comprises an alkyl radical having 1-10 carbon atoms, having a density 0.88-0.945 g/cc (page 6, lines 3-6);

Art Unit: 1796

2) 5-25%wt of a copolymer of propylene with ethylene and at least one alpha-olefin $\text{CH}_2=\text{CHR}'$, wherein R' is an alkyl radical having 2-10 carbon atoms, wherein the copolymer comprises:

- 80-98%wt propylene;
- 1-10%wt ethylene;
- 1-10%wt alpha-olefin, particularly butene (page 5, lines 13-15; page 7, lines 12-15);

And the copolymer is characterized by an insolubility in xylene of higher than 70% (page 4, lines 12-22).

27. Since **Govoni et al** discloses a similar ethylene-based copolymer blend including similar densities as the ethylene-alpha-olefin copolymer of **Glick et al**, but having improved processability and improved mechanical properties (see page 1, lines 4-7 in **Govoni et al**), therefore, it would have been obvious to a one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the ethylene-based copolymer blend of **Govoni et al** in the composition of **Glick et al** to produce films having improved processability and improved mechanical properties (see page 1, lines 4-7 in **Govoni et al**).

28. Since the composition of **Glick et al** in view of **Govoni et al** is essentially the same as claimed in the instant invention, therefore, the ratio between MD tear resistance and TD tear resistance will obviously fall within the same ranges as claimed in the instant invention.

Art Unit: 1796

29. As to instant claim 12, though the use of the composition for making the elastic tapes is not specifically recited, since the composition of **Glick et al** in view of **Govoni et al** comprises improved physical properties, including improved tear resistance (see page 9 in **Govoni et al**), and both compositions of **Glick et al** and **Govoni et al** are used for making films, therefore, it would have been obvious to a one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made, to produce multilayered extruded films to be used as tapes.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Irina Krylova whose telephone number is (571)270-7349. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am-5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasudevan Jagannathan can be reached on (571)272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/I. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/Vasu Jagannathan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796